



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 7, 2004

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr
Admin Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2004-2827

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 198095.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information relating to a specified request for proposal. You state that you will release some of the requested information. However, you claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.305 of the Government Code.¹ We note that you have submitted correspondence indicating that you have notified Hansen Information Technologies, Inc. ("Hansen"), Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola"), Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc. ("Computronix"), and BearingPoint, Inc. ("BearingPoint"), the third parties whose information is at issue in the current request, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain circumstances). Hansen has responded to the notice, asserting that portions of its information are excepted by section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered Hansen's arguments and reviewed the information you submitted.

¹ Although you raise section 552.305 as an applicable exception to disclosure, we note that this section of the Government Code does not constitute an exception to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Accordingly, we do not address whether any portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.305 of the Government Code.

Initially, we note that you acknowledge that the city has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. You state that the city received the present requests for information in December 2003. The city did not request a decision from this office until January 22, 2004. Consequently, the city failed to request a decision within the ten-business-day period mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

Additionally, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You did not submit any of the information required by section 552.301(e) within fifteen business days of receiving the requests.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling interest is demonstrated when some other source of law makes the information confidential or when third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). As third-party interests are at stake in this instance, we will consider Hansen's arguments.

We next note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Motorola, Computronix, and BearingPoint have not submitted to this office their reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Consequently, these third parties have provided this office with no basis to conclude that their responsive information is excepted from disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3

(1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information relating to Motorola, Computronix, or BearingPoint on the basis of any third party proprietary interest.

We now turn to Hansen's arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, a "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is *not simply information as to single or ephemeral events* in the conduct of the business, *as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract* or the salary of certain employees. . . . *A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.* Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (emphasis added); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

The following six factors are relevant to the determination of whether information qualifies as a trade secret under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;

- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 232 (1979).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also* *Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Hansen asserts that certain portions of its proposal are protected under both prongs of section 552.110. Having carefully considered Hansen’s arguments, we conclude that it has established a *prima facie* case for trade secret under section 552.110(a) for the information we have marked. We conclude that Hansen has not established a *prima facie* case for trade secret with respect to the remaining information it seeks to withhold. However, we conclude that Hansen has demonstrated that portions of the submitted information relating to pricing constitute commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause it substantial competitive harm. We have marked the information that is protected under section 552.110(b). We conclude, however, that Hansen has failed to demonstrate the applicability of either aspect of section 552.110 to the remaining submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”).

Finally, we note that some of the information submitted by the city may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Hansen's proposal under section 552.110. The city must release the remaining information in Hansen's proposal and all of the information in the other proposals to the requestor. The information that is protected by copyright must be released in accordance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer E. Berry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 198095

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeffrey C. Tung
Accela, Inc.
4160 Dublin Boulevard, Suite 128
Dublin, CA 94568
(w/enclosure)

Mr. Marcos R. Quintan
CSDC Systems Inc.
5946 Bayou Grande Boulevard, NE
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Denny Strange
Account Manager
Hansen Information Technologies
1745 Markston Road
Sacramento, CA 95825
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Schlusser
Motorola, Inc.
Western Division, North America Group
6450 Sequence Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Herman Leusink
President
Computronix (U.S.A.) Inc.
7515 West 17th Avenue
Lakewood, CO 80215-3302
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Helena Tantillo
Managing Director
BearingPoint, Inc.
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)